

2

~~702. h. 6~~
6

A N

A N S W E R

TO THE

PAMPHLET OF G. T. WLOEMAN, L. L. D.

Wrote by him, in Vindication of Dr. BURKHARDT'S

System of Divinity,

BY

CHRIST^R. FREDERIC TRIEBNER,

Late MINISTER of a GERMAN Congregation,

IN GREAT EAST-CHEAP, LONDON.

K

"An unjust man is an abomination to the just; and he that is upright in the way is an abomination to the wicked."—Prov. xxix, 27.

London,

Printed for C. F. T. and Messrs. RIVINGTONS,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD.

[Entered at Stationers' Hall.]

ADVERTISEMENT.

AS I have learned by a particular friend a few days ago, that the PAMPHLET of Mr. WLOEMAN, hitherto sold by Mr. ROBINSON, Paternoster-Row, and transmitted by him to respectable societies and persons, has of late been withdrawn; and, as I am likewise informed, that Dr. BURKHARDT, the intimate friend of Mr. WLOEMAN, disowns his concurrence in the publication thereof, to which, however, he has been instrumental and privy, for times past—the judicious Reader needs not to be solicited to consider these circumstances in their proper light, occasioned perhaps not from sincere penitential motives, but from fear and disappointment; may he also construe every expression, tinged with some degree of warmth, as proceeding from the importance of the cause; and excited by the impious contempt thrown upon a subject which not only in itself, is the most sacred—and therefore under the sanction of the laws of this country—but also of the most salutary tendency to promote peace of mind, public tranquillity, and national comfort, in the present awful conjunctures of public affairs—when nothing but a sincere avowal of the truth of God, and obedience to his laws, will bring down a blessing upon other means, necessary for the protection of a Nation, hitherto spared by the Mercy of the Almighty.

LONDON, May 2, 1799.

A L E T T E R.

SIR,

ON my return from a journey, I found your pamphlet on the Trinity, &c. in vindication of the Rev. Dr. Burkhardt's system of Divinity, for the Use of Schools, against what you call "the aspersions of the Rev. Mr. Triebner," together with a note, dated the 5th of Feb. written in the German language, to the following purport, translated into English by me.

"REV. SIR,

"DO not take it as a mark of contempt, that I, from my own impulse, have taken the liberty of answering your letter to the Rev. Dr. Burkhardt. In indifferent concerns I shall make it my duty, at all times, to demonstrate to you in reality, that I am, and remain with due esteem,

"REV. SIR,

"Your devoted servant,

"GOTTLOB THEOB. WLOEMAN."

On reading your violent personal invectives against me, which ought to have nothing to do with literary productions, I could hardly reconcile them with this your polite note, and form the conclusion, that both had been written by one and the same person; but convinced, that unhallowed politeness often participates in the venom of scurrility, I contented myself with the persuasion that it is at present my lot to have to do with a polite*****whom to answer I should find, perhaps, no great difficulty, but to convince of acting the part of a busy body would be business of infinite trouble, because your disposition calls you often to do much where there seems but little to do, and perhaps nothing at all.

I, therefore remained unresolved, whether you deserve any answer or not, but when I read, page 59, that you are determined "never to read or answer in future any of my confused publications", and that

B

the

the only use to be made of them is to light a pipe, &c. &c." I thought a line or two on a subject, which you, in your note, hold not to be indifferent, might lead the public, in some measure, to consider the scope of your book, neither indifferent, nor without danger. I shall therefore make it a point, that, though I must of course address it to you, you shall not have it in your power to light a pipe with every one, nor to execute the etceteras, unless you purchase or suppress the whole, as it is the practice now with our illuminates, concerning every book not of the modern stamp, for a hodge podge religion.

So much for your introduction—but as to your vindication of Dr. Burkhardt's system of divinity, I think, in general, Dr. B. will not find much eligible reason to delight in it, except it be in the language of the above description, and in your design, which, of course, is one and the same with that of his book, namely, the building of old babylon's tower, which, you know, neither the Chaldeans nor modern Romans could effect, because their languages were confounded, and they themselves were dispersed on the face of the earth, by the God of truth, who is but one. I, for my part, do not think that any of the sincerely scrupulous on the subject of the trinity, will find the 'clouds of their understanding dispelled,' and that 'prejudice will even further invite the inquiry of the learned,' by the reading of your book, because the truly learned of God, (of others I make no account,) believe the manner of the existence of the blessed Three in One, as the grand pillar of Christian truth, inexplicable, and willingly leave it to the prerogative of Jehovah, who knows himself best, and has fixed it as the basis of faith on divine revelation, as a mystery, which, if cleared from the additions of men, as it is manifested in its simplicity to the patriarchs, cannot shine brighter by any, even the most rational illustrations, as it does in the three first chapters of Genesis, of which the writings of the prophets and apostles are its sealing confirmation, absolutely independent of Chaldean, Egyptian, Pythagorean, and platonic philosophy, which, as arrogating the authority of truth, made its appearance by incoherent systems, 3500 years after. Even Christ, in calling Jehovah the Elohim of men, referred to Moses, Matth. xxii. 32-44. to testify the three in one.

I proceed, Sir, to your Address, and beg leave to observe to you, perhaps totally ignorant, or partially informed of what has happened between Dr. B. and me, on that subject, eight years ago, that your charge of "aggression, unprovoked, frivolous, and vexatious", is not merited by me, who only holds what the holy scriptures, the Lutheran and other orthodox churches hold, on that point, but strictly just against Dr. Burkhardt. This is, therefore, the first falsehood, which, like that you mention, page 36, of having attempted

tempted to obtrude myself on his congregation, in the year 1786, in his absence," I am very willing not to attribute to you, but to your spiteful, nay malignant informer, who has the impudence to assert things, which his own friends, as well as his own conscience, and congregation, would completely refute. The proof of this assertion will shortly appear in documents held by impartial hands: but, if his "superior talents" stand in need of such a pigmy in theology as you are, to support his notorious falsehoods, which even you might have easily detected, had you first heard all sides, or impartial witnesses. I shall never consider "the taking up of your pen," as the spear of Goliath against little David, in the refutation of my doctrine, which, thanks be unto God, is not mine but Christ's.

Neither do I despair that your supposed "want of judgment, want of sufficient knowledge of sacred literature, want of a (new fangled) christian and brotherly love, in me" shall disappoint you and your readers of the result of your "enquiry into my performance," neither shall it "discredit my head or heart," in their utmost simplicity, fully correspondent with one another in hating black designs, and whenever I err, my head and heart are as open to conviction, as they are bold for execution, when they are in the right.

Should it be the case that from the simplicity of my "head and heart, arises that confusion," which you say, "makes it a difficult task to read any of my writings," I may retort, that you and your client, with every one of yours of the same stamp, are totally strangers to it; that ancient and modern notions of Frantic philosophy have bewildered your head, and alienated your heart from bible-truth.

But I shall now briefly follow the statement of your three imputations. 1st. That I had misunderstood, and misrepresented Dr. Burkhardt. 2ndly, That I hold very wrong and erroneous notions in divinity. 3dly, That my letter was wrote from a bad principle and an evil design.

Here I must appeal to those who know but a tenth part of Dr. Burkhardt's conduct towards me, and to those who know me, and have read but the tenth part of any of my books, who will, no doubt, be compelled by their candor, and judgment to declare, "these are three abominable falsehoods;"—but for the sake of those, who, like you, have never seen nor heard me, as you candidly confess; and for the sake of truth, which you, having read my book, misrepresent, vilify, and totally condemn; the following observations I

hope, will clear me from imputations, which personal pique and malice have invented and dictated to you.

First. It would certainly prove the weakness of the intellect of an author, to write against a book, whose spirit and design is not understood by him; and I gladly thank you, that you explain and confirm both the spirit and design of Dr. Burkhard's book which is exactly the same, (bible truth wherewith error is tarnished excepted,) as I understood and stated it, in my letter. I fully agree with you, that the Dr. writes professedly with a view "to leave out such disputable points of religion, in which even the most learned have found themselves the most bewildered." But the questions here are, who gave him right and authority to leave out such points of religion which are avowed mysteries, necessary for establishing faith, and the rest of the soul, which he openly professed to teach, and on which terms he has entered upon the ministry, and receives his salary? Why did he not protest against these disputable points before he entered upon the office as a Lutheran minister? Or, if an improvement of knowledge were practicable on these points of religion, why did he not give notice to his congregation,—whose children, and those of the public at large, he means to instruct in a way different from that, which their fathers together with the Jewish and christian churches, believe to be bible truth?

Again, if he proposes, as you say, to reduce the system of the Christian religion to some plain and certain points of doctrines and precepts, founded in scripture.—Why doth he abandon that system, (I mean that lutheran catechism) on which real protestantism is founded by holy writ, which, by the most judicious divines, not only of our church, but also of others, has been thought the most plain and pious ever published, and is almost universally acknowledged, even by Calvinists, &c. Why doth he take out of the hands of youth a catechism stamped by the most revered authorities, and substitutes another, which is far from being calculated to establish youth in what they really know and believe on scripture proof, under the patronage of the church and their fathers;—nay preceded also the augsburgh confession, afterwards politically established, and confirmed in all public treaties, which is far more fit for reconciliation, than his and your jargon? Suppose the Monthly Reviewers and the editors of the Evangelical Magazine have pronounced his book "a desideratum of sacred literature," is that literature, which they applaud, of a more sacred nature, than that approved of by the christian church, as founded on sacred writ only? Suppose his lordship, the learned and pious bishop of London, whose name you rather

rather abuse here, has done him the honour of calling it "a pious publication, as you say page 3, is it therefore to be a substitute for that of the church of England and others, which have been honoured by equally pious and good men? Why do you not also take notice of those letters received by him from others, and the following censure by the Editors of the Monthly Rev. Magazine 1797. Supplementary Number, page 516.

"Dr. Burkhardt has attempted a System of divinity for the use of Schools, he offers this system as dis-encumbered from controverted doctrines, and embracing only such plain and essential doctrines of religion, as are universally acknowledged to be indisputable. In attempting to simplify this system of divinity, however, Dr. B. has substituted assertions for proofs; and in omitting the evidence of the divine authority of the Mosaic and christian revelations, he inculcates a stupid credulity, rather than a desire of investigating, the grounds of religious knowledge."

I have been told by clerical persons, who have no small skill, experience, and condescension, to accommodate themselves and their doctrines to the capacity of youth,—that it is far from being adapted to render the disputable points more intelligible, and obvious to the understanding; that in many places the answers to the questions are neither accurate nor suitable; that it, at best, serves a hodge podge religion in the hands of every designing heterodox teachers; who may turn the answers of youth just as he pleases, and thus instead of lessening the number of sects and parties must of course increase them, and render church and state a perfect babylon.

I am far 'from raising an outcry against a work,' if useful; or to represent him as an heretic, or to imitate those zealous bigots, who raise suspicion of heterodoxy, against truly enlightend and good men, when there is not the least appearance of danger," as you insinuate to the public, page 4.

I wrote from the purest motives, and concern for the safety of the public, and the church of God, which is and has never been better off, but when its ministers contended for the grod old faith, "once delivered to the saints" by the writings of Moses, the prophets, Christ, and the apostles;" which in our time are designedly perverted for ends, the most mischievous, destructive, and unaccountable, as they were by papists from the time of the reformation.

If you, and Dr. B. entertain not the least apprehension of dan-
ger,

ger, and indulge yourself in innovations, it follows by no means, that there is no danger in the present crisis, where avowed atheists, and deists, in alliance with Romanists, play a deep scheme, which challenges the discretion and fidelity of protestant loyalists, who improve toleration only for union with God, his church, and the state.

Whoever has observed the progress of the innovations of Jesuits, and the Roman church from the time, when Luther and his associates professed, in the face of papists, "that the holy scripture, and the apostolic faith are their only norm of faith, manners, and judgment; that the bible is its own interpreter by the Holy Ghost; that the literal sense is not to be abandoned without necessity, &c." will coincide with me that it has been the artful endeavors of that church, and her designing votaries, to undermine the authority and foundation of the holy scripture itself, to encourage heterodoxy, and dissensions among protestants. And the decree of the French national convention the 28th ' Sep. 1791. related in the chronological Epitome of the most remarkable events of the revolution, Sold on Ludgate hill, runs thus, "to admit men of all colours, and religion to public places, according to the rights of men, if they acknowledge the French constitution of 1791." Here, Sir, is the leopard with his spotted skin, described Rev. xiii. and xvii.

This has been acknowledged by the pope in his letter to Buonaparte, dated the 24th Dec. 1796, with an express declaration, "that though he has made the most excessive sacrifices to an unbounded toleration," (namely, by the late combination permitted by God, Rev. xvii. 17.) yet he has not forgot that he is the father of whole christendom." In that capacity, Sir, he is acknowledged by the peace of Tolentino, which, as a *circumvenire* engrossing all, was made no sooner than peace with the duke of Tuscany, and other German catholic and protestant powers, was concluded. And to give full scope to the revolution, that very peace with the pope, was made three weeks after the oath of hatred against all kings, in whom, next to God, the independent rights of nations are bound up, against the court of Rome and its allies, was imposed upon an armed republic of 25 millions, who, in conjunction with every other conquered state, are under a legal obligation to execute the existing laws and treaties of an oligarchical jesuitical Directory. In such a view, sir, I ask you, as a sworn protestant, and public defender of its real rights, is there no appearance of danger for real protestant and other independent nations, to be reduced again under papal and atheistical slavery? You, perhaps, like other secure and presumptuous protestants will say, "the pope is deposed, banished from his see,—his power is abolished—he is a prisoner."—To this I answer, supposing

supposing it even to be so, as it is foretold Rev. xvii. 8. "The beast which was, is not, and yet is;"—this is not by the will of the French but by the overruling power of God; which, by no means, discharges the duty of praying and striving against his coming again from the bottomless pit.—Out of many instances I quote his case with Charles V. whose army not without the Emperors will, had declared Luther to be pope, and Charles himself kept Clem. VII prisoner in St. Angelo, he also ordered public prayers to be made for his deliverance in all the Austrian dominions, but he knew very well what terms to make with him, for subduing Germany, and the protestant states.—And suppose the present pope should die, another, viz. the elector of Cologne, brother to the present Emperor, is already agreed upon, as public record says, to follow him. Are you then sure that all is safe, as long as the powers of Europe do not unite in a bible-system of one faith and judgment against French and Roman impositions? Be not secure, but tremble, Sir.

You will, perhaps, say, the world is too much enlightened to be led by the nose as formerly;—to this I answer, just so thought and believed the Genevans, dutch, swiss, and other protestant states; now conquered chiefly by their credulity, nay, jesuits and illuminates, urge such arguments artfully to deceive in order to betray. Illumination without faith in Christ, (the only guarding principle, of which the church is now almost destitute, and the world ignorant,) is not only no barrier for safety, against intriguing delusion, but carries along with it the righteous judgments of a provoked God, who, for the fulness of his grace and truth, profusely spent upon protestants and this country, demands gratitude, watchfulness, and constancy in keeping that truth, which gave them religious, and political independency, from oppressive papal errors!

You say I do not understand the design of Dr. Burkhardt's book. Be that design what it will, if he abandons the old foundation, he can make no stand against this powerful delusion, and the creed of the French, &c. founded on the above decree; not to say, this serves as a manœuvre to bring recrimination upon protestants for making a schism from the Roman church, and pleads the necessity of introducing a new system, whose tendency to reconcile the French and other protestant churches with herself, is the final scope of the revolution; this was advertised in the year 1796 in the morning Chronicle, June—which you will find in the Appendix of my Five Letters to the Critical Reviewers, with short paraphrases of my own in parenthesis. Neither Dr. Burkhardt's book, nor your method of reading Greek backward, can make head

head against it, or should your materialized logos, and speaking chaos, be substituted for the real logos of Jehovah, or the speaking Elohim, and be made the basis of a new babylonian creed, this would doom you and them to hell.

You say, page 3, Dr. B. purposes to reduce the system of the christian religion to some plain and certain doctrines and precepts, founded on scripture : this is as much as to say the doctrine of the Trinity, the real atonement of Christ, faith justifying and working by love, hitherto taught by Lutherans and the christian parties, is not founded in scripture, because these parties have used the terms Trinity, person, forensic sense, which the scriptures do not use. Here, sir, I may justly oppose arguments *ad hominem*.

It appears plainly from Dr. B's. definition of Christ, that he uses terms which are far less, than those of our own, founded in scripture ; though perhaps he, as well as our divines, will say, though the terms are not exactly found, yet the matter is founded in scripture. But, Sir, where in scripture, is that false definition found, which Dr. B. gives of Christ, p. 15, saying, " Christ is the " most extraordinary and dignified person that ever existed." Where is it said in scripture, " God took the names of Father, Son, and " Spirit, not to describe his manner of existence, but his manner " of acting ?" Where is it said, " the atonement of Christ is made " after the Jewish and heathen sacrifices ? Where in scripture is it said, of the immortality of the soul of man that it is " a particle " of the Spirit of God ?"

The inventors of the terms Trinity, person, &c. had that well meant view to assign by short technical terms, those doctrines, which are plainly found in scripture, if in that they, as you say, page 8—11, imitated the Chaldeans, Etrurians, Latins, Greeks, &c. You ought not to condemn them, especially as Protestant churches never imposed them absolutely, when only the *assigatum* was preserved.

As to his reducing the system of the Christian religion, ' to some plain and certain doctrines and precepts,' with which he, according to your own account, page 4, intends a reconciliation of all parties, under the banner and standard of immutable and eternal truth I wish it might not be under the cloke of a mistaken theophilanthropy, which, being the new religion of deists in France, knowing nothing of Christ's divinity and atonement, cannot induce men to repentance and faith, for a reconciliation with God. It is interfering with the prerogative of Elohim, whose power, and most perfect knowledge of good and evil, will not suffer men to bend his sceptre, by sacrificing any part of his truth to such a humanity.

Those who take it upon themselves to reconcile all parties, under what they call the banner of eternal and immutable truth, need only to set forth Christ as the true Elohim, or Messiah, who, as eternal wisdom has the most perfect knowledge of good and evil ; he is also self-sufficient to save, to the very uttermost, both from erroneous doctrines and sinful practices, as from misery, death, hell, and the Devil—Spinoza spoke, also, of *eternal and immutable truth, of the decrees and providences of God*, but he, like the French, understood by it, the *Universe—an almighty Republic*. As long as an author or minister speaks not out clearly, that Christ, *who knew no sin, was made sin, nay a curse* for us—that by death he has destroyed the power of death, he is not to be trusted, as a preacher of reconciliation.—2 Cor. v. 14 and 21.—He will either substitute a superficial philanthropy, or have recourse to false indulgences from delusive quarters.

As to your second charge, *that I hold very wrong and erroneous notions of divinity*, which you, (page 6) with an uncommon conjuration, endeavor to bring to your test, and myself to a conviction, I must own, I have been as unable to find out what you mean by your test, as I find myself still unconvinced of errors. Is your test that lamentation, which you wofully utter (page 7 and 8) against ancient and modern philosophers, and corrupters of truth, I heartily join with you in the lamentation ; but, when you (page 34) declare “*that you like to follow the way which the oldest philosophers have pointed out,*” you appear to me, lamentably inconsistent with yourself—and like the Ostrich, blowing cold and warm, in one breath defend and reject one and the same thing.—You will therefore excuse me, when I admit neither your own way, nor that of the ancient and modern philosophers, as a test to try and prophane sacred truth by it.

As you (page 9) flatly deny that Jehovah signifies the Father, but only the Godhead manifested in human nature—which, however the holy scriptures, and even heathen nations universally hold, to be the essential name denoting the Supreme Being.—Again, when you hold that Elohim is not the Son of Jehovah another in state—when, however, Christ distinguishes himself, by calling Jehovah, the Eloha, his God and his Father.—*Mat. xxvi. 46.—John xx. 17.—compare Ps. xlv. 8*—where it is said of the Messiah or Elohim, that his Elhoa, has annointed him as Elohim, who is also called Jehovah, distinguished from another.—*Gen. xix. 24.*—and last, when you hold not the spirit of Elohim, moving upon the waters (*Gen. i. 1.*) to be the

Holy-Ghost, but a material power, emanating from God; whom, however, *David* in the xxxiii *Pf.* expressly calls the spirit of Jehovah, nay of the Logos, and mouth of Jehovah, I think myself acquitted from being tried any longer by your nonsensical test.

When you (page 9) suppose me not possessed of sufficient *knowledge of Eastern language and literature*, (which you display from page 9 to 20), I heartily confirm your supposition to be so; nay, I am proud of that ignorance, when nearly all the christian schools and universities of Europe are in the same predicament of having been ignorant, hitherto, of your new method to derive the Greek words, *Logos* and *Chaos*, and the reading of them from the right to the left, from the Chaldee and Hebrew, for the perverting the doctrine of the Trinity. This Method may, indeed, be called with more propriety, as you do my calculation, (page 35), *A la Maniere de Wloemen, Advocateur de la Catechisme de Dr. B.* By that method you construe the eternal Logos in conjunction with Chaos, to be mere matter emanating from God, who of course, can be nothing else; and as Dr. B. holds the soul of man to be a particle of the spirit of God, the conclusion cannot fail, that you both act in concert for the establishment of refined materialism.——O, happy ignorance! may this abominable doctrine be buried into eternal oblivion!——No wonder that you, with such principles, appear an advocate of Pythagorean and Platonic philosophers; and especially of Plotinus, who, with the rest of ecclesiastic philosophers, from the 3d till the 7th century, proved themselves corrupters of the purity and simplicity of the Christian Religion. Out of his school came Porphyry, and whole swarms of blasphemers of Christ and the prophecies of Daniel.——Also, Origines, indefatigable as he was in the christian cause, in writing no less than 6000 volumes, (according to De Pin, Eccl. Hist.) explained, however, the simple doctrines of the Gospel, by the Platonic philosophy; and thereby gave scope to those heterodox doctrines, which caused so much dissention and wars in the Christian church: it gave also rise to the swarms of Monks, which (under king Apollyon, *Rev. ix*), did minister, and are still remaining in the Roman church, as the jannizaries of the Pope, tho' dispersed into all parts of the World, to serve his interest.——From that school also, came Julianus apostata, that patriarch of modern apostates in the civil line. I will not say that it was by his mode of alegorizing the holy scripture by the Platonic philosophy, that Pope Hormisdas was led to condemn that orthodox tenet, *one of the Trinity has been crucified*—which serves Pelagianism—and deprives Christ of his glory as Redeemer.

This

This Plotinus, you (page 14), defend against Mr. Wieman, because you say, he *wittingly, but not wisely, called him a philosophic fool*. What may be the reason, Sir, that you and Dr. B. come forward with this doctrine of syncretistical philosophers; that you endeavor to persuade the public that "their and your doctrine, exactly coincide with the holy scriptures," that by these the doctrine of the Gospel must be rationalized and explained, I must leave to your conscience—but I am inclined, Sir, to retort upon you, your 3d charge, (page 3) and say, Either you have no scope at all, and "*write as a fool,*" or "*you write from a bad principle, and a malignant design.*" I am astonished to read such stuff in a Christian and Protestant Country in the present awful crisis, when every thing is at stake, in consequence of an unbounded licentiousness of Press and Speech. For a more full information of Plotinus, I refer you and the reader, to Dr. Mosheim's Eccl. Hist. Vol. 1. page 211, 239, and Senior Brucker's First Principles, or Extracts from his History of Philosophy, especially of the Ecelectic Sect, page 190, 207, the German work—where he calls that sect headed by Ammonius, Saccæus, and Plotinus, a Syncretistical monster of philosophy—a mixture of the opinions of all sects, highly inimical to natural and christian truth—in consequence of which Arianism, Mahometism, Popery, bad policy, the scholastic jargon took place. He wrote from the same principle of a mistaken humanity, whose tender mercies are cruelty in completion; witness the bloody wars and persecutions of christian parties, commonly headed by the ecelectic philosophers, from the 3d to the 7th Century; and the humane French Revolution, founded on the *Atheistical Rights of Men*, and the Constitution of 1791, acknowledged by the holy father.—Page 20, 27, You charge me, contrary to my express words, with believing *three separate persons*; nay, with believing *four Gods!* and, strange enough, even with Socinianism, Atheism, and Idolatry, because I lay too much stress on the different signification of the names Elohim and Jehovah; saying, that *I have improved very little by the progress which religious knowledge has made these fifty years—that Moses had found at least, two different manuscripts & documents, one of which had the name Elohim, and the other Jehovah.* In support of which you quote Eickhorn's Introduction into the Books of the Old and New Testament, Vol. II.

In answer to this your charge, Sir, I might retort upon, and charge you and Dr. B. in possession of several eminent Works, wrote in less than 30 years, in Vindication of the Doctrines of the Trinity, with a wilful neglect

to improve the progress of that Doctrine ; I mention here only the Rev. Dr. Ursberger, resigned senior of the Lutheran Ministry of Augsburgh, who, from that remarkable text, *Col. ii, 1, 2*, has proved the distinction between the triune Jehovah, in an unmanifested essential Trinity ; to whom the names Father, Son, and Holy-Ghost, do not essentially belong, though the cause of such is a undescribable three-fold bond of union, in the very essence of Jehovah ; else Jehovah would not have manifest himself as Father, Son, and Holy-Ghost, if no such three-fold union did exist in the *communicative* Jehovah. This union is called by him, the essential Trinity, which as manifested in the Father, the Son, and the Holy-Ghost, is distinguished by him by the name of a *manifested* Trinity ; and thus the Doctrine of the Church, concerning the existence and actions of a Divine Father, Son, and Holy-Ghost, manifested, for the sake of the world, in the accomplishment of the divine purposes, is vindicated against Antitrinitarians. This distinction is fully grounded in the three first chapters of Genesis ; where Elohim, (the plural of Eloha) takes the lead, without being compounded with Jehovah ; and when we find that from the 4th verse of the 2d chapter, to the 24th of the third chapter, the works of the creation, preservation, and redemption, are ascribed to Jehovah, as they were to Elohim in the 1st chapter ; we conclude that distinct as Jehovah is in state, from Elohim and his spirit, they are in essence and design, of one and the same nature, because, Jehovah an absolute singular, and Elohim a plural, are construed almost universally with the verb singular—the unity of Jehovah manifested in Elohim, is evident beyond contradiction, because he is communicative. Hence it is that Elohim, when purposing to make men, (*Gen. i. 26,*) said not, *I will make men*—“ *but, let us make men in our own image, &c.*” Ch. ii, 7.

Thus the Jewish church, in the Bereshit Rabba holds, according to Reinbeck, in his Augsburgh confession, that the spirit of Elohim is the spirit of the Messiah ; if so, Elohim, must of course, have been believed by ancient Jews, to be the Son of Jehovah, as David says, *Psalms ii, 7.—xxxiii, 6*. This Doctrine of the Blessed Three-in-One, you more corrupted by your jargon of a metaphysical Trinity of existence, space, and time, and a physical one of fire, air, and water, as all the heretics hitherto known, have done—for the support of which, you (page 13, 31) make not only wrong quotations from Plato, Tertullianus, and others, but would also force the plain scripture sense, and the passage of Dr. Munter, in the case of Count Strunsee, into a confirmation of your nonsense.

Plato,

Plato, and the platonic fathers, & before them, the Guostiks, whose errors the Evangelist John corrected in his Gospel & Epistles, are too well known to the Lutherans, concerning their Doctrine of the Trinity, and its *Logos* : for the sake of brevity, I refer you to Chambers' Encycl. (Rees' edit.) Art. Platonism, where you will find that Plato is charged with having stolen his doctrine from Moses and the Jews; and corrupted it in the bargain, as Huminius, Theodore, &c. charge him.

As to professor Eickhorn's probabilities, "that Moses found, at least, two different manuscripts and documents from which he compiled his history," viz. one of Elohim, the other of Jehovah. You do very well that you "draw no conclusion," for your wooden metaphysical and physical Trinity, against my mathematical proofs from the difference between the state of Jehovah, independent of world making; and that of Elohim, or the Logos, by whom, and his spirit, Jehovah made, preserves, rules, redeems the world, sanctifies and saves the church, and rejects the wicked.

As Eickhorn had it not in his immediate view, to prove the divine inspiration, but only the authenticity of the books of the Old Testament, a variety of documents from different persons who had but one design, in giving the accounts of the origin of the world; and what passed in their age, might rather corroborate than weaken my arguments for that difference between the state of Jehovah and Elohim; because, if Adam, who lived 930 years, transferred the immediate revelation, which he had of Jehovah Elohim, to Seth and Enos, and these to Noah, who lived 600 years before and 356 years after the flood, to Shem, who lived cotemporary with Abraham, the friend of God, with whom he made a covenant, to which God referred Moses, at the time when proud Pharoah disputed, if not the existence of Jehovah, yet his peculiar right to command the Children of Israel to come out of Egypt, saying, (*Exod.* vi. 2, 3,) I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and to Jacob, by the name of El-Shadai—and as to my name Jehovah, was I not known unto them?—it is a sure proof, that if there existed different documents at the time of Moses, concerning God, they agreed in the most substantial names of God, of which, that of Jehovah, denotes his self-existence. The Holy-Ghost secures the absolute unity and indivisibility of Jehovah, even when that name is compounded with Elohim, when Jehovah Elohim appeared unto the patriarchs in a parasitic body; or as Jesus, in the body assumed from the Virgin Mary—that body was made and not self-emanated,—*Heb.* x, 5.—wherefore the Hebrew word, *memra*, signifies also matter, as it doth Logos.

The

The construction of both these names, when compounded with one another, by the verb singular, from the 4th verse, chapter 2, to the end of chapter 3, and throughout the Bible, can only testify that great truth, that Jehovah, who is connected with the world, by Elohim and his Spirit, was before the world, *Jehovah only*, without manifesting his wisdom, power, &c. to the creatures, to whom the other names of God bear a relation; in which absolute state, God, even as Father, shall be after this world has passed away, when he shall be all in all, without any attack from the enemies of his indivisible unity, so often dishonored from the time of the fallen Elohim's (angels), and usurping tyrants.—*Gen. vi, 4.—1 Cor. xv, 12, 28.*

It is also a gross untruth when Eickhorn says, "*that after the name Elohim had been used single, without exception, in Genesis the 1st Chapter, to the 4th of the 2d, the name Jehovah compounded with Elohim, was also used without exception, from verse 4th of the 2d to the end of the 3d chapter,*"—because it is evident from the 1st to the 5th verse of the 3d Chapter, that the old serpent, or rather Satan, in him, together with Eve, mentioned only Elohim, without Jehovah. The reason Satan had, was to make a division in Christ's kingdom.—Elohim, known to angels and men, as the manifested Jehovah, who, for the sake of the world, should know limitations, or evil, as he did good, was the object of Satan's and man's rebellion, that they might substitute themselves in his place; and that Satan might make men dependent on him only. He, as a cunning lawyer, took advantage of man's carelessness and ignorance of evil; and led him on against his Maker, whom he knew was appointed and fore-ordained, by the covenant of Jehovah, to be also the Lamb slain for the sins of the world—and not willing to serve Elohim and men, in that condition, he devised man's fall, to sully his Maker's glory; and finally, to triumph over both, by the instrumentality of sinful men, in a separate independent kingdom. But Jehovah Elohim, acting the part of a judge, in the case of men, reclaimed his creatures in mercy, by receiving them into his union and communion through faith in the promise, saying, "*Behold, Adam is become as one of us.*" Verse 22.—Even in his forlorn state he shall have a Saviour, one of us, Jehovah Elohim, in human nature; equal in all points but sin.—*Heb. ii, 10, 18.*

Had Moses found two different documents, the one of Jehovah, the other of Elohim, the history of the Paradise and the Fall, which is but one, could not appear in one part, under the names Jehovah Elohim, who

gave

gave the command not to eat of the forbidden tree—and in its transgression, under Elohim, who was known to Satan and Eve, in his limitations, on account of the world. In that voluntary covenantal limitation of the Logos, which was in the beginning with Jehovah, we ought to look for the reason why Christ said “*the Father is greater than I.*” But what purpose doth your opposition to this Doctrine serve, in the present crisis, when there is no other remedy against the evil consequences arising from the usurpation of the Republican principles of unity and indivisibility, liberty, equality, &c. by a cunning and powerful enemy, than a *full reinstatement* of these principles to their primitive scriptural authority; by which alone, the united Christian, and especially Protestant nations, may, under the help of the Almighty, procure an honorable peace; which certainly no confederacies, weapons, fleets, and armies, have been able to establish without it?

Are you and Dr. B. afraid to see the nations of the earth united under Christ their only inheritor—or are you afraid to see fathers, in the domestic, civil, and ecclesiastical states, taking the pattern for Christian unity and indivisibility, of their families and household, from the infallible example of Jehovah, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ? Are you afraid to see our sons and daughters live up, by virtue of the best sort of liberty, to the example of the most perfect obedient Son of God, who by his blood saves them from their sins and eternal wrath?—Are you afraid to see the principle of the equality of divine perfection and laws, possessed and executed by each divine person; also to be possessed and practised by each individual man, and Christian? Do you fear the Golden Rule, to be practised too much without lawyers?—“Whatsoever ye will that men should do unto you, &c.”—and no more transgressed amongst the sons and daughters of disobedient Adam and Eve? Are you afraid that compact, between men and nations, hitherto made in the name of the blessed Trinity, for the security of life, freedom, and property, and the renunciation of Satan and all his works, used in the vow of baptism, shall be preserved without wars and law-suits?

As a malignant enemy to politics, founded on scriptural principles, (though ever so applicable to the nature of things), you, (page 35) shew your reluctance to take notice of authenticated truth, *that the French have in view to restore the Pope to a general dominion*; this I have proved from the nature of their politics already established; of which, you know that not
only

only the Pope's universal spiritual authority, which claims the right to govern all, as the soul doth the body, is acknowledged by them in the peace of Tolentino; that also, the independent cause of Protestantism, as a fundamental law of the empire, was sacrificed by the treaty of Campo Formio, to the French Republic, the Pope's friend and ally. Though you know from the holy scriptures and history, that Rome, and not Paris, is the City which claims the right of sovereignty over the kingdoms of the earth,—*Rev.* xvii. 18.—Though you know that the French Directory, with Abbe Seyes, and other of revolutionary leaders, act in the spirit of Romulus, and that most of them are practical Jesuits, and apostate priests of the Roman Church; that they are capable of any thing but what is good and truly Protestant in its primitive sense; yet you call it "*abominable & malicious*," when I prove that French politics have a papal soul, and that that soul is unity and indivisibility of the whole earth. With the same reluctance, you decline to take notice of my calculation of the number 666, as the number of the Roman beast, or fourth monarchy—plainly pointed out, *Rev.* xiii. and xvii, compared with *Dan.* vii, 23, 25, viii, 9, 25, ix, 26, 27, and xii, 7. which I cannot avoid to repeat here with some improvement.

This calculation, you insultingly say, is taken from the Cabbala, which, however, I have never seen, nor read; and it remains with you to prove and quote the book and the page, where, in the Cabbala, you have found it. Though I am far from the least degree of vanity to claim "originality and genius," as you and our silly philosophers do, whom you and Professor Kant, (page 6, 8,) *justly call blind followers and school-boys, who repeat what their infallible masters have taught them.*—(I add, what they have stolen from divine revelation); yet, I challenge you, and others of your stamp, to prove that my calculation is taken from the Cabbala: this calculation, from the time of the creation till now, is consistent with the lives and deaths of the most remarkable persons, *viz.* Adam, Noah, Abraham, Christ—consistent with the most remarkable events of the reformation, & the French Revolution; with Usher, Whiston, from the three profane chronological histories, *viz.* The Olympian *Æra*, 779 years—the Roman *Æra*, 752 years—the Babylonian *Æra*, by the astronomical Gnomon of Ptolomy, 749 years before Christ: You must prove, Sir, that it originates in its *peculiar connexion* with the Cabbala, or any other author than myself. If you can prove that, I will gladly clear you from the imputation of being an impostor,

postor, an advancer of falsehoods, an enemy to self-evident truth, and that just merit which I, under the blessings of God, have a right to claim and defend against your charge of folly and nonsense, on my part.

I therefore am bold in challenging you, a professed Protestant, who takes the Bible, his norm of faith, manners, and judgment, *to disprove* what I have advanced in support of the grand truth of all truths, namely, the Bible-Doctrine of the blessed *Jehovah, or Three-in-One*, manifesting himself as Elhoa in Elohim, and his spirit, by creating the world in six days, and resting on the seventh: that to Jehovah, to Elohim, to the spirit of Elohim, belong the glory of giving space, and time to the world; that he appointed the times and the seasons, the day, the week, the month, the year, by the ordinary course of the planets; that, by way of numeration, the 3 Sixes, make what is called, in the writings of Daniel, and the Revelation of St. John, a time; that 3 Seyens placed after one another, characterize the first week, by the triune Jehovah, 777; that by way of multiplication, the number three, as the multiplier of 777, gives 2331, or three times 666 and 333; which, according to *Dan. vii, 25*.—are a time, times, and half a time, appointed by the triune Jehovah, for the full reign of the Roman Monarchy, until the time of the Reformation, when it was broke into pieces; namely, 2300 years after the date of Rome, by the independent political Establishment of divine truth, in England and Germany, under the remarkable name of Protestantism, which, as reputed, is in reality, enmity to all what is unreasonable, and not founded in holy writ, because it bears analogy to the first Gospel Promise, *Gen. iii, 14, 15*, to the prophecies of *Dan. Chap. ii, 44*,—and more especially to *Chap. viii, 9, 14, 23*.—You ought to disprove the little horn, coming after one (and not out, as the common translation gives it) of the four Alexandrian horns, viz. The Grecian and Macedonian kingdom, to be the City of Rome; though little known at the time of Daniel's prophecy, yet encreased its well-known greatness, under various vicissitudes, until the time of the Reformation, when the truth of God, represented by Daniel, under the Name of *the Sanctuary*, (verse 14,) was cleansed from papal, and other human errors and superstitions, brought into the church by the eclectic Philosophers, Origines and other Authors, in the 3d Century, &c.—and as this sanctuary had a host (the temporal sword) for its protection, from the time of Noah, (*Gen. ix*.) until the first and second destruction of Jerusalem, by Nebuchadnezzar and the Romans—the restoration of it took place by the Protestant princes,

for the protecting truth in the year 1552, and has ever since prevailed against the City of Rome, and its allies and votaries—even under the patronage of the predecessors of the present Emperor, who is still called the Roman, though supporting a *protest* against every thing which is unscriptural and oppressive by virtue of his coronation oath, established in the most solemn treaties, now endangered by the treaty of Campo Formio; and as it is the peculiar fertility of every divine and prophetic truth, that one proposition often contains the foundation of two or more propositions, applicable to similar events, if the omniscient and all-wise Author, who has foreseen them all, had it in view to point them out: so is it with these prophecies, concerning every thing which is proved, tyrannical, proud, and unjust, be it ever small; for instance:—

When the established truth was opposed, and nearly oppressed, in this Century, by the artful influence and intrigues of the Court of Rome, God blessed the arms of the Protestant host of England, Prussia, &c. with success; first, by the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, 1748, in which the Protestant cause in its independency, was recognized and confirmed, by this country, and the powers of Europe: then the 2300 prophetic years, had a second fulfilling, because, 552 and 1748, is 2300 years; but as the number of the beast is not 2300, but 2331: we know, that when the American troubles, excited and encouraged by France, and the votaries of Rome, brought this country near the brink of ruin, God checked the power of its enemies by a most signal victory, in the year 1779, of which myself was an eye witness, in the Siege of Savannah in Georgia, which is famous on account of the particular interference of divine providence, because gained almost without the loss of any lives—the 2331 years from the date of the vision 552—555 years before Christ, had then also a second fulfilment; because, if 1779 years are added to 552, (the date of the prophecy), it makes 2331, or 3 times 666 and 333 years, or a time, times, and half a time, according to *Dan. vii, 23, 25*—add 3 years more to 1779, it makes 1782, the time of the American peace—and as it is evident, that the last vision of Daniel, (*Chap. xii*), happened 534 years before Christ, (see the Chronol. numbers in King James's Bible) according to Usher, Whiston, and others, these 534 added to 1797, (the year when Pius VIth, acknowledged the atheistical abstract principles of the French Constitutions, which originally are still scriptural truth, though atheistically usurped, misapplied and acknowledged by France and Rome, make again 2331 years, and give the third proof of the

divine

divine inspiration of these prophecies, by the spirit of truth, who, as the spirit of Jehovah and of Elohim, made the world in six days.—If this is Cabbala, I wonder that it has not been promulgated to the world by the Rabbies, or any other ancient or modern author. I am sure, if it had been known, Mr. Gibbons, the Author of the History of the Rise and Fall of the Roman Empire, would not have passed without refutation of his objection to the ancient mode of reckoning by numerical letters.—Ambition as well as love and truth, would not have been silent to the assertions of an author, who wrote in defiance of the Christian and Mosaic Institution: moreover I have been positive in proving that these 2331 years, are as many common days, and applicable to the most remarkable events of the Revolution. Some of these are in my letter to Dr. B.—Page 6—where you must have found that singular one foretold several months before there was any likelihood it would come to pass—that *with the end of the last year the scheme of the Dragon, to devour the Church, shall be closed*, Whether the secrets of the treaty of Campo Formio, which were to be put into execution at that time by France, and the Emperor, applies to the events (from the period of the 10th of August, 1792; celebrated as the abrogation of Christianity and Royalty, by a festival, on the 21st of September, 1792, and the 31st December, 1798) or not? let public candour decide, if inclined to mark the footsteps of the truth, displayed in the judgements of God. As for my part, I make it ever a point of conscience to be attentive to the awful signs of the present times; and I may now boldly venture the credit of the divine inspiration of the Revelation of St. John, (Chap. xii), in saying, That, after England has finished her three times 666 and 333 years, in the present war, which commenced with the close of the month of Jan. 1793, when she, with other powers of the earth, making war against an atheistical Republic, fulfilled that remarkable prophecy, *Rev. xii, 13, 17. xiii*,—by which we learn, that the apostolic Church, with the crown of twelve stars, nourished in the wilderness from the face of the Dragon, for a time, times, and half a time, under the two wings of the great Eagle, is delivered from being drowned by the stream of false politics and antichristian philosophy, which the mutinous dragon poured forth from his mouth: a great change will take place; and the subsequent prophecies, from Chap. xiv to xx, will speedily be fulfilled, concerning the politics of Europe, which, by help of the Almighty, will be for the advancement of everlasting truth, to the glory of God and his Christ, who, as king of kings

and

and lord of lords, shall reign for ever and ever. What may become of Popery is easily foreseen; and it seems that the sham deposition of Pious VIth, Feb. 15, 1798, by order of Berthier, will be corroborated by the hand of God, as seriously, as the acknowledgement of an atheistical Republic in Feb. 1797, has characterised Antichrist in full, in the person of a pretended Vicar of Christ, Rector of the World, and Father of Princes and Kings; because, BRAXI*, the family name of Pius the VIth, in Greek numerical letters, is 333; which is the latter part of the number of the Roman beast, 3 times 666 and 333. *Dan. vii, 25. Rev. xiii, 18. xix.*

The objection made to the method of the Hebrews and Greeks to count by numerical letters, can avail nothing against a well connected series of self-evident scriptural and historical truth. Dr. Rambach, in his Hermeneutic, quotes from the Rabbies, that they hold every Alef, wrote with a dash, to signify 1000 years; and as the first verse of the first Chapter of *Genesis*, holds six Alefs. In the words *Elohim created the Heavens and the Earth*: the doctrine that the age of this world should be 6000 years, according to the six days of the creation), to which the words of Moses (*Psalms 90*) and the Apostle Peter, 2nd *Ep. iii. 8*, give emphasis) coincide exactly with the great number 3 and 666; because, nine times 666, and the six days of the creation, make exactly 6000 years. And as the number 666 (in Hebrew Romiith, Romish) is applicable to Romulus, the founder of Rome, it is remarkable that 333, the latter part of the dominion of Rome, should be found in the Greek letter, BRAXI, the family name of a Pope, bearing the number VI, who, after he had acknowledged an atheistical Republic, and changed the number of Cardinals from 70 to 24, received the declaration, when seated on the Papal throne, in the Chapel of Sixtus, on the Anniversary of his elevation: *your reign is at an end*. Well may we say with the triumphant Church, (*Rev. xv, 3*), *Great and marvellous are thy works, Lord God, Almighty—just and true are thy ways thou king of kings*.

Another objection to my calculation, may perhaps be made, from the universal custom of writers on Prophecies, and the sacred numbers, that a

time,

* See the Rev. Mr. WRANGHAM'S Sermons, *Rome is fallen!* preached at the Visitation held at Scarborough, last year.

time, times, and half a time, signify 42 months, 1260 days prophetic, or common, or 3 years and a half; but, true as it is, "that a year as part of a time, &c." which I in my books, and especially in my Key to the French (Revolution, have also applied to the period from the 3d and 14th of Sept. the date of the Constitution of 1791, to the 4th of March, 1795, when the coalition was broke by the Grand Duke of Tuscany, &c.—during which time, it may be justly said, the Christian Religion, which Christ calls a City, (*Mat. v, 14.*) the Holy City, was trodden under foot by the nations, (*Rev. xi, 1, 14.*)—because it is exactly 42 months from the time of that Decree made by the National Assembly, "that men of all colours and religions, should be admitted to public places, according to the Rights of Men, if they acknowledge that constitution." So that it is also 1260 days when the two witnesses of Christ's atonement prophesying in sackcloth, were politically killed, by the beast ascending from the atheistical abyss; yet, adding 666 days to the 4th of March, 1795, it leads to the 24th of Dec. 1796, when things took a providential turn for this country, by the destruction of the French fleet in Bantry-Bay; when the Pope in his letter to Buonaparte, discovered the mystery, as Father of Christendom, and made peace as such; three weeks after the oath against kings was imposed; we find these 42 months and 666 days, correspond with this event,——Thus the truly apostolic Church, represented (Chapter xii), under the emblem of a woman, crown'd with a crown of twelve stars, was threatned 1260 days by the Dragon, by his sevenfold Antichristian Constitutions, full of 1. Artfulness.—2. Murdering.—3. Lies.—4. Unholiness.—5. Unrighteousness.—6. Hatred.—and, 7. Unmercifulness—by his ten Antidecalogian horns, (*Rev. xiith and xiiith*, which power he gave to the Roman beast, to make war with those that keep the word of God: we add one year more, from the peace of Tolentino, 1797, to the deposition and banishment of Pius VIth, February, 1798, it makes 3 times 666 and 333; yet the original key to that, is the number 3, and the six days of the creation, by the triune Jehovah, which define the creation of the world at large, and the duration of the Roman beast; also from the date of Rome, the 42 months and twice 666 days prophetic, apply to Pope Hormisdas, who denied the atonement by the name of Jehovah Elohim, and to papal episcopacy; from that time, tyrannical Rome, was not and yet is; (*Revelations xviith, 8.*) because this Pope was the first who used the sword against those whom he held

erroneous

erroneous.—(See *Bower's History of the Popes*). And when we find all this concentrated in the present Revolution, ought we not to say with the triumphant Church, *true and faithful are thy judgments, O Lord!*—Rev. xix.

Finally, as the number 666, characterises Romulus the founder of Rome, by the Hebrew word Romiith, 752 before Christ; and the establishment of the Papal right of power against the power of *right and truth*, 752 years after Christ, or 666 years after the Revelation; when Pope Stephanus, by his spiritual authority, sided with Pipin the Usurper, and the people of France, against Childeric their lawful king: I trace *the rights of the people against kings, by the Pope*, and those of the Pope against both, (in which apostacy from the truth of God, by false philosophers and priests was the leading cause), to their proper sources—and conclude thus: *Whatsoever errors are pointed out by the Holy Scriptures and History, as inimical to the glory of God and the good of mankind, ought to be defended neither by nations, nor by individuals.* And as you vindicate philosophical and other errors, you act against the glory of God, the good of mankind, and, especially against the spiritual and temporal interest of this protestant Country—which can only be saved on the old good foundation, which is union with God, his Church, and the public state; by faith wrought and sealed by the word and spirit of God, independent of Satanical, papal, philosophical, and heretical errors, of which, Christ, by his word, and enlightened Church, is Judge.



